

IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF OREGON
 Benjamin Barber
 v
 Vance, State of Oregon

3:16-CV-02105 AC
 Motion to convene special Grand
 Jury under 18 USC 3332

FILED 01 SEP '17 10:43 USDC-ORP

Moves now, the plaintiff to full fill his duties and right to protect and defend the laws of the United States against all enemies foreign and domestic.

Barber is known by reputation in the public as a defender of civil rights, government accountability and the rule of law, as recorded by in the Oregonian.

"It is the duty and right... of every citizen to assist in prosecuting and securing the punishment of any breach of the peace" in re quarkes vs 959 960 (1984)

"the function of a grand jury is to investigate any alleged crime no matter how or by whom suggested to them"
 Frisbe v United States 15 US 586 US (1895)

"a citizen has a constitutional right to inform the government of violation of Federal law, a privilege of the 14th amendment" - 676 F2d 1272 9th Cir

to wit Barber begrudgingly finds he must endeavor to assist with the prosecution of Criminal law, because the defendants are not forth coming and are actively obstructing justice with spurious justifications, and are unwilling to operate in good faith. The Defendants conspire to oppress persons for the exercise of rights, exhort property used in interstate commerce by means of fraud, and resemble a racketeering influenced corrupt organization.

Case 3:16-cv-02105-AC Document 135 Filed 09/01/17 Page 2 of 6
IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF OREGON
Benjamin Barber
V
Vance, State of Oregon
3:16-cv-02105-AC
Motion to Convene Special
Grand jury under 18 USC 3332

To be fair I read in a Legal book the Criminal Defense bible that this is permissible, but I lack the resources to double check the reasoning. The motive is that I want transparency, reform, and accountability, and ever... Since I was young I was taught the necessity of mensch to stand up for what's right. My experiences regarding Cronyism in Oregon go back to childhood, my interest since I was 23, and my participation in combating it from 26. I will be filing with the attorney general the specific grounds for relief in a few days under John Doe v Does 1-20 under seal. I understand this seems zealous and ill advised, but I get a feeling that there is something the defense does not want me to find out, and it may have to do with money atwood. The circumstances and timing of all this are odd, as are the environment under which the State operates, at least from the perspective of an idealist

"It is the duty and right ... of every citizen to assist in prosecuting and securing the punishment of any breach of the peace"-in re quarks vs 959 960 (1984)

"The function of a grand jury is to investigate any alleged crime no matter how or by whom suggested to them"-Frisbe v United States 15 US 586 (1895) "informing is a right or privilege secured by the constitution" Villarréal v United States 354 F2d 9th Cir (1965) "a citizen has a constitutional right to inform the government of violation of federal law a privilege of the 14th amendment 676 F2d 1272 9th Cir (1982)

Civil Rights and Liberties, are separate but equal.
 How is it that Ron Paul and Bernie Sanders, or Feminists
 and mens rights groups, both talk about rights and mean
 separate things? First we must realize that "Civil Rights" is a
 proxy for "liberties", and a civil society must balance them
 in order to be just, in such a way to be seen as fair and
 balanced. many philosophers have tried to encapsulate the
 meaning of liberty, and I will start from first principals
 to demonstrate where they come from, and then later how to
 apply them. Justly, this is known as 'justice as fairness'.

Liberty as a triadic relation (Socratic Logic)

"X is free from Y to do/not do, or be/not be" or in math terms
 $\sum (x)$ where x is an element in a set of persons constraining Y
 $\sum (y)$ where y is an element in a set of persons effected by x
 $\sum (z)$ where z is an element of a set of properties characterizing y
 Such as $g(y \cdot z)$ is the product of relationships of y and z,
 and $f(x \cdot y)$ is the product of relationships of x and y
 therefore Liberty is the product of $L((x \cdot y) \cdot (y \cdot z) \cdot (x \cdot z))$ or
 $(g(x, z) \cdot g(y, z) \cdot f(g(x, z), g(y, z))) = L(x, y, z)$

the numbers of these relationships increase as a cube, power
 of the size of the sets. so we label them in either their
 relationship to x and y or in relationship to z. in relation to
 x or y it often is known as 'positive and negative liberty', and in
 relationship to z it is known as 'power, control, responsibility'

'Justice as Fairness', A theory of Justice revisited by John Rawls
 Memorandum of Law regarding: "Liberty" and "Civil rights" Page 1

positive and negative liberties refer to the power to compel or not compel a thing to occur (to posit) and the power not to be compelled by others (to negate). an innate right is one that no person can compel of you, and the civil right is one protected by the government. Aside from the fundamental and civil rights, power, control, and responsibility speak to compelling forces in life. power is defined as "to be able" (or refrain), control is to compel (or not), and responsibility is to be compelled to do (or not do).

Sovereign rights are however derived from the consent of the governed, and in exchange the sovereign has "noblesse oblige" obligations towards its subjects, since the magna carta to obey the law and rights of its subjects despite its prerogative. There can be no qualified immunity of sovereigns who act not merely under law, but to undermine the rights guaranteed to people and acting upon the color of law. The fourteenth amendment obligates the states to respect the bill of rights, and contrary to popular belief the welfare clause does not give the government the authority to abridge them, due its 'compelling government interest' which require infringing or punishing a person based solely on an innate or civil right.

The welfare clause is supposed to act like a social safety net, or the rising tide that lifts all boats, not the entity picking or choosing winners or the dictator choosing what job, lifestyle, or belief system is the right one. When the sovereign represents the tyranny of the moral majority, it reflects the fairness defined by social justice not blind justice under law but mob justice of the

Realpolitik. The practical issue is laid out in the lifeboat dilemma, where there are more passengers than room (or supplies) on the boat. We inhabit a finite planet and the practical liberties are finite, so in many aspects the trade off between liberties of say X and Y are a zero sum game. Often members will want to both be empowered, and in control but not responsible, or to make someone else responsible for matters outside their control, or sometimes put something else in control of making someone else responsible for empowering them, which also apply contrapositively. Put in laymans terms democracy becomes two wolves and a sheep voting for what to have for dinner, and of course civil rights.

This is why it is intolerable to many to leave aspects of civil rights up to the states and their elected officials, who are often more beholden to special interests than to the general welfare. Each group from banks to unions to feminists will give up control of their own fate to the government in exchange for more power and less responsibility, and inevitably come to blame the government for failure. On the other side will be those whose interests were sacrificed at the holy altar of democracy, who will see themselves as victims of the prevailing party and who will also blame the government for its failure. This is known as Karpman's drama triangle, where the drama starts by one party taking the role of victim, finding a rescuer to punish the perpetrator, and flipping the roles continuously. The key to dissolving the drama is to deny the payout to participants who seek to lobby the rescuer and to the perpetrator into a 'negative sum game', so all sides engaging in drama are going to lose. For what company will seek a bailout if it means all shareholders lose value, or welfare recipients made to work for a domestic violence shelter.

The same deterrent in denying the political payout must also exist for political figures, they may be allowed to debate and speak in such a way that advocates for the abolition of civil rights, but the question ought to be should we even allow the bill of rights to be put to a vote. Hypothetically Congress and States could abolish the bill of rights and generally be immune under the speech and debate clause. Let's say in a hypothetical situation to allow debt slavery and imprisonment, many would even lack the fundamental ability to vote as felons. However a special grand jury ought to be allowed to convene to investigate criminal charges in order to stop such a process, by allowing the grand jury to recommend removal from office. Such a move would be a part of checks and balances, not made on behalf of the judiciary but by the people and for the people, who defend liberty by the three boxes: the voting box, jury box, gunbox.

The voters in Oregon approved our equal rights amendment, just as the states ratified the bill of rights. We already have evidence, perhaps not beyond a reasonable doubt, that some of our state officials are engaged in financial conflicts of interest. There is also a growing body of evidence that they also have political conflicts of interest, and these conflicts are brewing into actual violent political conflicts fueled by their actions. So the solution to a fundamental failure of government to regulate itself is to allow the actions of its stewards to be investigated by a grand jury, to find if there are sufficient grounds to either find them unfit or restrain their liberty, as a deterrent against the sovereign powers first conceived by the Magna Carta which first forced the sovereign to obey the law.